



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,851	07/03/2003	James M. Alkove	MS1-1537US	6872
22801 7590 04/07/2008				
LEE & HAYES PLLC				
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500				
SPOKANE, WA 99201				
EXAMINER				
POWERS, WILLIAM S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2134				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/07/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/612,851

**Applicant(s)**

ALKOVE ET AL.

**Examiner**

WILLIAM S. POWERS

**Art Unit**

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 18-23 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, pages 26-27, filed 2/14/2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 and 18 under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of "RFC: 1889, RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications" by Schulzrinne et al.
2. As to Applicant's argument that the combination of Wee and Sengodan is improper "because there is nothing in either of the references that would suggest this reason [e.g., to encrypt and authenticate RTP packets in IP communications]", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner has provided specific column and line numbers to support the motivation to combine (Sengodan, col. 1, lines 10-13) (see page 5 of the previous Office Action). In addition, the Applicant further argues that Sengodan was filed prior to Wee. The Examiner agrees with these facts. It is pointed out that both the Sengodan and the Wee patents have priority dates before the priority date of the instant application. Therefore, both Wee and Sengodan are legal references that can be used against the instant application. It does matter if the priority date of one reference is before or after the priority of another reference in a 103 rejection because they are both available as references **before** the priority date of the instant application.

***Response to Amendment***

3. Claims 1, 4, 18 and 22 have been amended.
4. Claims 6-17 and 24-59 have been withdrawn.
5. Claims 1-5 and 18-23 are pending.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

6. The Information Disclosure Statements submitted with the instant application have been considered. It is respectfully requested that the Application correct the following minor informalities in the Information Disclosure Statements mailed July 27, 2004, the RFC 1889 and 1890 references have the print date, but the publication date of the documents is required.

***Claim Objections***

7. In light of Applicant's amendment, the previous objections to the claims have been withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2134

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-5 and 18-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,983,049 to Wee et al. (hereinafter Wee) in view of US Patent No. 6,918,034 to Sengodan et al. (hereinafter Sengodan) in further view of "RFC 1889, RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications" by Schulzrinne et al. (hereinafter Schulzrinne).

As to claims 1 and 18, Wee teaches:

- a. Means for encrypting a data stream with an arbitrary block size to form a plurality of encryption units (received video data is segmented and encrypted) (Wee, col. 8, lines 58-60 and col. 9, lines 63-65).
- b. Means for packetizing the plurality of encryption units (packetizing the encrypted video data into packets) (Wee, col. 11, lines 1-5).

Wee describes the process of encryption and packetizing in real time (Wee, col. 18, lines 61-67), but does not expressly mention the use of RTP packets. However, in an analogous art, Sengodan teaches using RTP packets in communications transmissions (Sengodan, col. 5, lines 45-49).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to implement the data streaming scheme of Wee with the use of RTP packets of Sengodan in order to encryption and authentication of RTP packets in IP communications as suggested by Sengodan (Sengodan, col. 1, lines 10-13).

Wee as modified further teaches:

- c. Each RTP packet including:
  - i. An RTP header (Sengodan, col. 7, lines 48-50 and fig. 3, ref. 314).

- ii. One or more payloads of a common data stream consisting of one or more said encryption units (packet includes at least encrypted video data and an unencrypted header data) (Wee, col. 11, lines 1-5).
- d. One RTP payload format header for each said payload and including, for the corresponding encryption units, a boundary for the arbitrary block size (mini-header contains data for the mini-packets that make up the RTP packet and include information regarding length of the mini-packet as well as identification information) (Sengodan, col. 6, lines 23-39 and fig. 2a-b and 3).

Wee as modified does not expressly mention the separation of audio and video data into RTP packets. However, in RFC 1889 that details the standards of the Real-time Transport Protocol, Schulzrinne teaches:

- e. There is a separation of audio data and video data into the RTP packets without containing mixed media payloads (audio and visual media are transmitted as separate RTP sessions) (Schulzrinne, section 2.2, paragraph 1).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to implement the data streaming scheme of Wee as modified with the separation of the audio and video data into separate RTP packets in order to "allow some participants in the conference to receive only one medium if they chose" as suggested by Schulzrinne (Schulzrinne, section 2.2, paragraph 2).

Wee as modified further teaches:

- f. Wherein the RTP packet header of each packet contains information relating to the separation of the audio data and video data (Synchronization source is carried in the RTP header so that the packets can be reassembled at the destination) (Schulzrinne, section 3, paragraph 7).

As to claims 2 and 19, Wee as modified teaches:

- a. Means for reassembling the plurality of encryption units using:
  - i. The payloads in the plurality RTP packets (assembling the decrypted payloads of the RTP packets into an uncompressed video stream) (Wee, col. 11, line 64-col. 12, line 3).
  - ii. The respective boundary for the arbitrary block size in the respective RTP payload format header (the data contained in the mini-header is used in the reassemble and to keep track of multiplexed mini-packets that belong to different users) (Sengodan, col. 6, lines 23-39 and fig. 2a-b and 3).
- b. Means for decrypting the plurality of encryption units to form the data stream (decrypting the progressively encrypted and scalably encoded video data) (Wee, col. 11, lines 48-56 and fig. 12, ref. 1202).

As to claims 3 and 20, Wee as modified teaches:

- a. Each said RTP payload format header further comprises one or more attributes of the corresponding payload (mini-header contains data on length



indicator, channel identifier and sequence number of the mini-packet)

(Sengodan, col. 6, lines 23-39 and fig. 2a-b and 3).

b. Means for rendering the formed data stream using the attributes of the corresponding payload (streaming video is sent to clients' displays) (Wee, col. 1, lines 35-48).

As to claims 4 and 21, Wee as modified teaches said RTP format header consists of timing information (RTP provides time stamps for streaming of MPEG compressed video to ease error recovery) (Wee, col. 25-30).

As to claims 5 and 22, Wee as modified teaches means for transmitting the plurality of RTP packets over a network (transmitting secure and scalable data packets) (Wee, col. 20, lines 44-65 and fig. 25A-25D).

As to claim 23, Wee as modified teaches a computer readable medium comprising machine readable instructions that when executed, perform the method of claim 18 (computer-executable instructions) (Wee, col. 6, line 56-col. 7, line 6).

### ***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM S. POWERS whose telephone number is (571)272-8573. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571 272 3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/W. S. P./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2134

William S. Powers  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2134

4/1/2008  
/Kambiz Zand/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134